

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner made an initial objection to claim 2 given that Mn was contained within parenthesis. The parenthesis have been deleted as requested by the Examiner.

Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action concern a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, both first and second paragraphs with regard to the hardening agent of the present invention. As the Examiner correctly indicates, the hardening agent functions to crosslink with the binder component. However, the Examiner questions how some of the exemplified hardening agents would crosslink, particularly the diamond powder and WC. It is respectfully submitted that the original description provided on this aspect of the invention is accurate and complete to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to fully understand, make and use the invention. In general, the function of the hardening agent is to crosslink with the binder component. More particularly, each of the hardening agents specified in the application will chemically and/or mechanically crosslink with the binder component in order to assimilate the centering of the materials of the composition. That is, without the crosslinking aspect, the binder could just sit on top of the hardening agent. Instead, the hardening agent is preferably selected so as to be constituted by a finely powdered material that will crosslink with the binder in order to minimize any separation of the components. The Examiner specifically mentions diamond powder in questioning this aspect of the invention. It is respectfully submitted that cBN constitutes a diamond powder which actually does chemically crosslink with the binder component. However, in accordance with the invention, the crosslinking need not be chemical in nature but can be mechanical or both. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that all the hardening agents listed on page 9 of the specification, as well as other available hardening agents, could be utilized to chemically and/or mechanically crosslink with the binder component in accordance with the present invention. Based thereon, withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of the claims based on prior art, although the Applicant does not necessarily agree with the various positions taken by the Examiner (e.g., although Herber et al. teaches utilizing the coating composition on surfaces that are exposed to heat, there is no specific teaching concerning an oven cavity or rack) in order to further the prosecution in this particular application, the Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 16 into claim 1, placed claims 4, 18, 29, 43 and 50 in independent form, and added the limitations of claim 52 into claim 21. As all of these claims have not been rejected based on prior art, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant has clearly placed all the claims in this application in clear condition for allowance. Applicant reserves the right to file continuation or divisional applications to cover remaining aspects of the invention, as desired.

Based on the above, it should be readily apparent that the Applicant has made on earnest attempt to clearly place the entire application in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any additional concerns regarding this application which the undersigned can aid the Examiner in expediting the prosecution thereof, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Everett G. Diederiks, Jr.

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 33,323

Date: June 24, 2004

DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC

12471 Dillingham Square, #301

Woodbridge, VA 22192

Tel: (703) 583-8300

Fax: (703) 583-8301